

1 Sander L. Esserman (*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)  
2 Cliff I. Taylor (*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)  
3 STUTZMAN, BROMBERG, ESSERMAN & PLIFKA, P.C.  
4 2323 Bryan Street, Suite 2200  
5 Dallas, TX 75201-2689  
6 Telephone: 214-969-4900  
7 Email: [esserman@sbep-law.com](mailto:esserman@sbep-law.com)

8 Scott Summy  
9 John Fiske (CSBN 249256)  
10 BARON & BUDD, P.C.  
11 3102 Oak Lawn Avenue #1100  
12 Dallas, TX 75219  
13 Telephone: 214-521-3605  
14 Email: [ssummy@baronbudd.com](mailto:ssummy@baronbudd.com)

15 Christopher H. Hart (CSBN 184117)  
16 Kimberly S. Fineman (CSBN 184433)  
17 NUTI HART LLP  
18 411 30<sup>TH</sup> Street, Suite 408  
19 Oakland, CA 94609-3311  
20 Telephone: 510-506-7152  
21 Email: [kfineman@nutihart.com](mailto:kfineman@nutihart.com)

22 Attorneys for Public Entities Impacted by the Wildfires

23 **UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT**  
24 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

25 In re  
26 PG&E CORPORATION,  
27 and  
28 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC  
COMPANY,  
29 Debtors.  
30

31 Case No. 19-30088-DM

32 Chapter 11  
33 Lead Case, Jointly Administered

34 **DECLARATION OF SANDER L.**  
35 **ESSERMAN IN SUPPORT OF EX**  
36 **PARTE MOTION TO SHORTEN TIME**  
37 **FOR NOTICE AND HEARING ON**  
38 **MOTION OF PUBLIC ENTITIES FOR**  
39 **APPOINTMENT OF OFFICIAL**  
40 **COMMITTEE OF PUBLIC ENTITIES**  
41 **PURSUANT TO 11 U.S.C. §§ 1102(a)(2)**  
42 **AND 105(a)**

43 [No Hearing Required]

44 Requested Hearing on Shortened Time:  
45 Date: March 13, 2019  
46 Time: 9:30 a.m. (Pacific Time)

47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
8010  
8011  
8012  
8013  
8014  
8015  
8016  
8017  
8018  
8019  
8020  
8021  
8022  
8023  
8024  
8025  
8026  
8027  
8028  
8029  
8030  
8031  
8032  
8033  
8034  
8035  
8036  
8037  
8038  
8039  
8040  
8041  
8042  
8043  
8044  
8045  
8046  
8047  
8048  
8049  
8050  
8051  
8052  
8053  
8054  
8055  
8056  
8057  
8058  
8059  
8060  
8061  
8062  
8063  
8064  
8065  
8066  
8067  
8068  
8069  
8070  
8071  
8072  
8073  
8074  
8075  
8076  
8077  
8078  
8079  
8080  
8081  
8082  
8083  
8084  
8085  
8086  
8087  
8088  
8089  
8090  
8091  
8092  
8093  
8094  
8095  
8096  
8097  
8098  
8099  
80100  
80101  
80102  
80103  
80104  
80105  
80106  
80107  
80108  
80109  
80110  
80111  
80112  
80113  
80114  
80115  
80116  
80117  
80118  
80119  
80120  
80121  
80122  
80123  
80124  
80125  
80126  
80127  
80128  
80129  
80130  
80131  
80132  
80133  
80134  
80135  
80136  
80137  
80138  
80139  
80140  
80141  
80142  
80143  
80144  
80145  
80146  
80147  
80148  
80149  
80150  
80151  
80152  
80153  
80154  
80155  
80156  
80157  
80158  
80159  
80160  
80161  
80162  
80163  
80164  
80165  
80166  
80167  
80168  
80169  
80170  
80171  
80172  
80173  
80174  
80175  
80176  
80177  
80178  
80179  
80180  
80181  
80182  
80183  
80184  
80185  
80186  
80187  
80188  
80189  
80190  
80191  
80192  
80193  
80194  
80195  
80196  
80197  
80198  
80199  
80200  
80201  
80202  
80203  
80204  
80205  
80206  
80207  
80208  
80209  
80210  
80211  
80212  
80213  
80214  
80215  
80216  
80217  
80218  
80219  
80220  
80221  
80222  
80223  
80224  
80225  
80226  
80227  
80228  
80229  
80230  
80231  
80232  
80233  
80234  
80235  
80236  
80237  
80238  
80239  
80240  
80241  
80242  
80243  
80244  
80245  
80246  
80247  
80248  
80249  
80250  
80251  
80252  
80253  
80254  
80255  
80256  
80257  
80258  
80259  
80260  
80261  
80262  
80263  
80264  
80265  
80266  
80267  
80268  
80269  
80270  
80271  
80272  
80273  
80274  
80275  
80276  
80277  
80278  
80279  
80280  
80281  
80282  
80283  
80284  
80285  
80286  
80287  
80288  
80289  
80290  
80291  
80292  
80293  
80294  
80295  
80296  
80297  
80298  
80299  
80300  
80301  
80302  
80303  
80304  
80305  
80306  
80307  
80308  
80309  
80310  
80311  
80312  
80313  
80314  
80315  
80316  
80317  
80318  
80319  
80320  
80321  
80322  
80323  
80324  
80325  
80326  
80327  
80328  
80329  
80330  
80331  
80332  
80333  
80334  
80335  
80336  
80337  
80338  
80339  
80340  
80341  
80342  
80343  
80344  
80345  
80346  
80347  
80348  
80349  
80350  
80351  
80352  
80353  
80354  
80355  
80356  
80357  
80358  
80359  
80360  
80361  
80362  
80363  
80364  
80365  
80366  
80367  
80368  
80369  
80370  
80371  
80372  
80373  
80374  
80375  
80376  
80377  
80378  
80379  
80380  
80381  
80382  
80383  
80384  
80385  
80386  
80387  
80388  
80389  
80390  
80391  
80392  
80393  
80394  
80395  
80396  
80397  
80398  
80399  
80400  
80401  
80402  
80403  
80404  
80405  
80406  
80407  
80408  
80409  
80410  
80411  
80412  
80413  
80414  
80415  
80416  
80417  
80418  
80419  
80420  
80421  
80422  
80423  
80424  
80425  
80426  
80427  
80428  
80429  
80430  
80431  
80432  
80433  
80434  
80435  
80436  
80437  
80438  
80439  
80440  
80441  
80442  
80443  
80444  
80445  
80446  
80447  
80448  
80449  
80450  
80451  
80452  
80453  
80454  
80455  
80456  
80457  
80458  
80459  
80460  
80461  
80462  
80463  
80464  
80465  
80466  
80467  
80468  
80469  
80470  
80471  
80472  
80473  
80474  
80475  
80476  
80477  
80478  
80479  
80480  
80481  
80482  
80483  
80484  
80485  
80486  
80487  
80488  
80489  
80490  
80491  
80492  
80493  
80494  
80495  
80496  
80497  
80498  
80499  
80500  
80501  
80502  
80503  
80504  
80505  
80506  
80507  
80508  
80509  
80510  
80511  
80512  
80513  
80514  
80515  
80516  
80517  
80518  
80519  
80520  
80521  
80522  
80523  
80524  
80525  
80526  
80527  
80528  
80529  
80530  
80531  
80532  
80533  
80534  
80535  
80536  
80537  
80538  
80539  
80540  
80541  
80542  
80543  
80544  
80545  
80546  
80547  
80548  
80549  
80550  
80551  
80552  
80553  
80554  
80555  
80556  
80557  
80558  
80559  
80560  
80561  
80562  
80563  
80564  
80565  
80566  
80567  
80568  
80569  
80570  
80571  
80572  
80573  
80574  
80575  
80576  
80577  
80578  
80579  
80580  
80581  
80582  
80583  
80584  
80585  
80586  
80587  
80588  
80589  
80590  
80591  
80592  
80593  
80594  
80595  
80596  
80597  
80598  
80599  
80600  
80601  
80602  
80603  
80604  
80605  
80606  
80607  
80608  
80609  
80610  
80611  
80612  
80613  
80614  
80615  
80616  
80617  
80618  
80619  
80620  
80621  
80622  
80623  
80624  
80625  
80626  
80627  
80628  
80629  
80630  
80631  
80632  
80633  
80634  
80635  
80636  
80637  
80638  
80639  
80640  
80641  
80642  
80643  
80644  
80645  
80646  
80647  
80648  
80649  
80650  
80651  
80652  
80653  
80654  
80655  
80656  
80657  
80658  
80659  
80660  
80661  
80662  
80663  
80664  
80665  
80666  
80667  
80668  
80669  
80670  
80671  
80672  
80673  
80674  
80675  
80676  
80677  
80678  
80679  
80680  
80681  
80682  
80683  
80684  
80685  
80686  
80687  
80688  
80689  
80690  
80691  
80692  
80693  
80694  
80695  
80696  
80697  
80698  
80699  
80700  
80701  
80702  
80703  
80704  
80705  
80706  
80707  
80708  
80709  
80710  
80711  
80712  
80713  
80714  
80715  
80716  
80717  
80718  
80719  
80720  
80721  
80722  
80723  
80724  
80725  
80726  
80727  
80728  
80729  
80730  
80731  
80732  
80733  
80734  
80735  
80736  
80737  
80738  
80739  
80740  
80741  
80742  
80743  
80744  
80745  
80746  
80747  
80748  
80749  
80750  
80751  
80752  
80753  
80754  
80755  
80756  
80757  
80758  
80759  
80760  
80761  
80762  
80763  
80764  
80765  
80766  
80767  
80768  
80769  
80770  
80771  
80772  
80773  
80774  
80775  
80776  
80777  
80778  
80779  
80780  
80781  
80782  
80783  
80784  
80785  
80786  
80787  
80788  
80789  
80790  
80791  
80792  
80793  
80794  
80795  
80796  
80797  
80798  
80799  
80800  
80801  
80802  
80803  
80804  
80805  
80806  
80807  
80808  
80809  
80810  
80811  
80812  
80813  
80814  
80815  
80816  
80817  
80818  
80819  
80820  
80821  
80822  
80823  
80824  
80825  
80826  
80827  
80828  
80829  
80830  
80831  
80832  
80833  
80834  
80835  
80836  
80837  
80838  
80839  
80840  
80841  
80842  
80843  
80844  
80845  
80846  
80847  
80848  
80849  
80850  
80851  
80852  
80853  
80854  
80855  
80856  
80857  
80858  
80859  
80860  
80861  
80862  
80863  
80864  
80865  
80866  
80867  
80868  
80869  
80870  
80871  
80872  
80873  
80874  
80875  
80876  
80877  
80878  
80879  
80880  
80881  
80882  
80883  
80884  
80885  
80886  
80887  
80888  
80889  
80890  
80891  
80892  
80893  
80894  
80895  
80896  
80897  
80898  
80899  
80900  
80901  
80902  
80903  
80904  
80905  
80906  
80907  
80908  
80909  
80910  
80911  
80912  
80913  
80914  
80915  
80916  
80917  
80918  
80919  
80920  
80921  
80922  
80923  
80924  
80925  
80926  
80927  
80928  
80929  
80930  
80931  
80932  
80933  
80934  
8

1 I, Sander L. Esserman, declare:

2       1. I am an attorney licensed by the State of Texas and admitted *pro hac vice* in the  
3 above captioned bankruptcy cases pursuant to the Order Granting Application for Admission of  
4 Attorney *Pro Hac Vice* for Sander L. Esserman (Dkt. No. 230). I am counsel of record for the  
5 Public Entities<sup>1</sup> in the above captioned case. Unless as otherwise indicated herein, I have  
6 personal knowledge of the facts set forth below, and if called as a witness I could and would  
7 competently testify to the matters set forth in this declaration.

8       2. Attached hereto as Exhibit A is the Motion of Public Entities for Appointment of  
9 Official Committee of Public Entities Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §§ 1102(a)(2) and 105(a) (the “**PE**  
10 **Committee Motion**”), which the Public Entities ask to be heard on shortened time. By the  
11 motion, the Public Entities ask that the court direct the United States Trustee (the “**Trustee**”) to  
12 appoint an Official Committee of Public Entities.

13       3. As described more particularly in the PE Committee Motion, the Public Entities  
14 can and should serve a distinct and important role in the Debtors’ bankruptcy cases given (1) the  
15 unique nature of these proceedings and the Public Entities’ claims herein, (2) the scope of the  
16 effect these proceedings will have on the communities represented by the Public Entities, and  
17 (3) the distinct possibility the Debtors will seek statutory and/or regulatory concessions that  
18 could affect the Public Entities in order to effectuate a viable reorganization of the Debtors. It  
19 is critical that the Public Entities have the opportunity to assist in the progress of this case in a  
20 centralized and independent manner at the earliest possible juncture.

21       4. The Public Entities have for the past several weeks been in discussions with the  
22 Trustee regarding the appointment of an Official Committee of Public Entities. The Trustee  
23 ultimately declined to appoint such a committee on February 20, 2019, citing grounds that are  
24 addressed by the Public Entities in the PE Committee Motion. A true and correct copy of the

---

25       1 The Public Entities consist of the following California public entities: (a) Calaveras County  
26 Water District, (b) Napa County, (c) City of Napa, (d) Mendocino County, (e) Lake County, (f)  
27 City of Clearlake, (g) Nevada County, (h) Yuba County, (i) City of Santa Rosa, (j) Sonoma  
28 County, (k) Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District, (l) Sonoma  
County Community Development Commission, (m) Sonoma County Water Agency, (n) Sonoma  
County Sanitation District, (o) Town of Paradise, and (p) Butte County.

1 Trustee's letter declining to appoint an Official Committee of Public Entities is attached hereto  
2 as Exhibit B. The Public Entities therefore request that the Court appoint an Official Committee  
3 of Public Entities pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §§1102(a)(2) and 105(a).

4       5. Because the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors and the Official  
5 Committee of Tort Claimants have already been appointed by the Trustee and because critical  
6 early negotiations and other discussions regarding these bankruptcy cases are already underway,  
7 the Public Entities request that the PE Committee Motion be set for hearing by the Court at the  
8 Omnibus Hearing on March 13, 2019 at 9:30 a.m., or at the Court's earliest convenience, and  
9 that the deadline for filing and serving any opposition to the PE Committee Motion be set for  
10 March 11, 2019.

11       6. No previous time modification requests have been made related to the subject of  
12 the PE Committee Motion, either by stipulation or Court order.

13       7. The requested shortened notice period should have little to no impact on these  
14 cases since the party to whom the PE Committee Motion is primarily directed, namely the U.S.  
15 Trustee, has known of the relief requested by the Public Entities since January 30, 2019. Three  
16 weeks later, the U.S. Trustee relayed its decision to the Public Entities. Therefore, there is no  
17 prejudice to the parties-in-interest by shortening notice under the circumstances. Conversely,  
18 the Public Entities' interests are not represented by the committees currently appointed, although  
19 the Public Entities are a separate and substantial class of interests. Any additional delay in the  
20 Court's consideration of the PE Committee Motion may have substantial adverse impacts on the  
21 interests of all public entities in these cases.

22       8. On the morning of February 28, 2019, I contacted both counsel for the Debtors  
23 and the Assistant U.S. Trustee regarding this request to hear the PE Committee Motion on  
24 shortened time. Specifically, I requested that the PE Committee Motion be heard on March 13  
25 and that the deadline for responsive pleadings be March 11. I discussed the matter by phone  
26 with Debtors' counsel and followed up by email. A true and correct copy of this confirming  
27 email is attached as Exhibit C. Debtors' counsel indicated he would consult with his clients and  
28 get back to counsel for the Public Entities. I asked for a response by close of business on

1 February 28th. No further response has been received from either counsel for the Debtors or the  
2 Assistant U.S. Trustee.

3 I declare under penalty of perjury pursuant to the laws of the United States of America  
4 and the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge  
5 and belief. Executed this 1st day of March, 2019 at Dallas, Texas.

6  
7 /s/ *Sander L. Esserman*  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Sander L. Esserman

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
STUTZMAN BROMBERG ESSERMAN & PLIFKA, P.C.  
2323 BRYAN STREET, SUITE 2200  
DALLAS, TX 75201-2689  
TELEPHONE: 214-969-4900

## **EXHIBIT A**

1 Sander L. Esserman (*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)  
2 Cliff I. Taylor (*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)  
3 STUTZMAN, BROMBERG, ESSERMAN & PLIFKA, P.C.  
4 2323 Bryan Street, Suite 2200  
5 Dallas, TX 75201-2689  
6 Telephone: 214-969-4900  
7 Email: [esserman@sbep-law.com](mailto:esserman@sbep-law.com)

8 Scott Summy  
9 John Fiske (CSBN 249256)  
10 BARON & BUDD, P.C.  
11 3102 Oak Lawn Avenue #1100  
12 Dallas, TX 75219  
13 Telephone: 214-521-3605  
14 Email: [ssummy@baronbudd.com](mailto:ssummy@baronbudd.com)

15 Christopher H. Hart (CSBN 184117)  
16 Kimberly S. Fineman (CSBN 184433)  
17 NUTI HART LLP  
18 411 30<sup>TH</sup> Street, Suite 408  
19 Oakland, CA 94609-3311  
20 Telephone: 510-506-7152  
21 Email: [kfineman@nutihart.com](mailto:kfineman@nutihart.com)

22 Attorneys for Public Entities Impacted by the Wildfires

23 **UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT**  
24 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

25 In re  
26 PG&E CORPORATION,  
27 and  
28 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC  
29 COMPANY,  
30 Debtors.  
31

32 Case No. 19-30088-DM

33 Chapter 11  
34 Lead Case, Jointly Administered

35 **MOTION OF PUBLIC ENTITIES FOR**  
36 **APPOINTMENT OF OFFICIAL**  
37 **COMMITTEE OF PUBLIC ENTITIES**  
38 **PURSUANT TO 11 U.S.C. §§ 1102(a)(2)**  
39 **and 105(a)**

40 Hearing on Shortened Time:

41 Date: March 13, 2019

42 Time: 9:30 a.m. (Pacific Time)

43 Place: 450 Golden Gate Avenue, Ctrm 17  
44 San Francisco, CA 94102

45 Judge: Hon. Dennis Montali

46  Affects PG&E Corporation  
47  Affects Pacific Gas and Electric Company  
48  Affects both Debtors

49 \*All papers shall be filed in the Lead Case,  
50 No. 19-30088-DM.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	<b>I.</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>5</b>
2	<b>II.</b>	<b>JURISDICTION .....</b>	<b>7</b>
3	<b>III.</b>	<b>BACKGROUND .....</b>	<b>8</b>
4	<b>IV.</b>	<b>BASIS FOR RELIEF REQUESTED.....</b>	<b>10</b>
5	<b>A.</b>	<b>The Court should order the formation of a Public Entities Committee pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §§ 1102(a)(2) and pursuant to the Court's authority under 11 U.S.C. § 105.....</b>	<b>10</b>
6	<b>B.</b>	<b>Formation of a Public Entities Committee is necessary and proper to provide the Public Entities with adequate representation in these bankruptcy cases.....</b>	<b>14</b>
7	1.	<i>The unique interests of the Public Entities require formation of a separate Public Entities Committee.....</i>	<b>15</b>
8	2.	<i>The nature of these bankruptcy cases calls for a separate Public Entities Committee.....</i>	<b>17</b>
9	3.	<i>The unique nature of the Public Entities' Wildfire Claims requires that they be represented by a separate, homogeneous committee.....</i>	<b>18</b>
10	4.	<i>A Public Entities Committee would perform tasks that the UCC and Tort Committee will not fulfill.....</i>	<b>19</b>
11	5.	<i>Formation of a Public Entities Committee would not result in delay or unreasonable additional costs.....</i>	<b>20</b>
12	<b>V.</b>	<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>21</b>
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

## 1 TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### 2 **Cases**

3 <i>ADT Corp. v. Advantage Pkg. Inc. (In re ADT Corp.)</i> , 352 F.3d 1062, 1066 (6 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2003) .....	13
4 <i>In re Am. Atomics Corp.</i> , 2 B.R. 526 (Bankr. D. Ariz. 1980).....	11
5 <i>In re Baldwin-United Corp.</i> , 38 B.R. 802 (S.D. Ohio 1984) .....	11
6 <i>In re Beker Indus. Corp.</i> , 55 B.R. 945, 948 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1985).....	14
7 <i>In re Budd Co., Inc.</i> , 512 B.R. 910, 912-13, 915 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 2014) .....	15, 20
8 <i>In re City of Detroit, Mich.</i> , 519 B.R. 673, 679 (Bankr. E.D. Mich. 2014).....	12, 13, 14
9 <i>In re Dana Corp.</i> , 344 B.R. 35, 38 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2006).....	19
10 <i>In re Gates Engineering Co., Inc.</i> , 104 B.R. 653 (Bankr. Del. 1989).....	11, 12
11 <i>In re Hills Stores, Co.</i> , 137 B.R. 4, 6 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1992).....	20
12 <i>In re Johns-Manville Corp.</i> , 68 B.R. 155 (S.D.N.Y. 1986).....	14
13 <i>In re K.P. Enterprise</i> , 135 B.R. 174, 186 (Bankr. D. Me. 1992) .....	12
14 <i>In re Lion Capital Group</i> , 44 B.R. 684 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1984).....	11, 12
15 <i>In re Mansfield Ferrous Castings, Inc.</i> , 96 B.R. 779, 781 (Bankr. N.D. Ohio 1988) .....	14
16 <i>In re Mansfield Tire &amp; Rubber Co.</i> , 39 B.R. 974 (N.D. Ohio 1983).....	11
17 <i>In re Mehlhose</i> , 469 B.R. 694, 710 (Bankr. E.D. Mich. 2012) .....	12
18 <i>In re Mercury Finance Co.</i> , 240 B.R. 270, 277 (N.D. Ill. 1999) .....	12
19 <i>In re Pierce</i> , 237 B.R. 748, 753-54 (Bankr. E.D. Cal. 1999).....	14

1	<i>In re Residential Capital, LLC,</i> 480 B.R. 550 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2012).....	15
2		
3	<b>Statutes</b>	
4	11 U.S.C. § 101(41).....	9, 13
5	11 U.S.C. § 105.....	10, 14
6	11 U.S.C. § 105(a).....	5, 12, 14, 21
7	11 U.S.C. § 1102.....	13
8	11 U.S.C. § 1102(a).....	14
9	11 U.S.C. § 1102(a)(2).....	passim
10	11 U.S.C. § 1102(a)(4).....	12, 14
11	11 U.S.C. § 1102(b).....	passim
12	11 U.S.C. § 1102(b)(1).....	9, 11
13	11 U.S.C. § 1102(b)(2).....	12
14	28 U.S.C. § 157.....	7
15	28 U.S.C. § 157(b).....	7
16	28 U.S.C. § 1334.....	7
17	28 U.S.C. § 1408.....	7
18	28 U.S.C. § 1409.....	7
19		
20	<b>Other Authorities</b>	
21	Internal Revenue Code of 1986, § 414(d).....	13
22	Internal Revenue Code of 1986, § 457(b).....	13
23		
24	<b>Rules</b>	
25	B.L.R. 5011-1(a).....	7
26		
27		
28		

1 The Public Entities<sup>1</sup> hereby submit this Motion of Public Entities for Appointment of  
2 Official Committee of Public Entities Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §§ 1102(a)(2) and 105(a) (the  
3 “***Motion***”), seeking the prompt formation of an official committee of Public Entities (a “***Public***  
4 ***Entities Committee***”) pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §§ 1102(a)(2) and 105(a). The Public Entities also  
5 request the appointment of the Public Entities to the Public Entities Committee and such other  
6 related relief as the Court may deem appropriate.

7 The Motion is supported by the points and authorities set forth below, the concurrently-  
8 filed notice and supporting declaration of Sander L. Esserman (“*Esserman Declaration*”), and  
9 all other pleadings and documents on file in this matter.

# I. **INTRODUCTION**

12 The Public Entities are the representative governmental bodies of communities that were  
13 devastated by the 2017 Northern California Wildfires<sup>2</sup> and the 2018 Camp Fire<sup>3</sup> (collectively,  
14 the “*Wildfires*”). The Public Entities’ tort claims against the Debtors arising out of the Wildfires  
15 (the “**PE Wildfire Claims**”) are different, not only from the claims of individual tort claimants,  
16 but also from the claims of other governmental units who hold priority tax claims and other  
17 claims more traditionally asserted by governmental units. Indeed, there have been few (if any)

19 <sup>1</sup> The Public Entities consist of the following California public entities: (a) Calaveras County Water  
District, (b) Napa County, (c) City of Napa, (d) Mendocino County, (e) Lake County, (f) City of  
Clearlake, (g) Nevada County, (h) Yuba County, (i) City of Santa Rosa, (j) Sonoma County, (k) Sonoma  
20 County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District, (l) Sonoma County Community Development  
Commission, (m) Sonoma County Water Agency, (n) Sonoma County Sanitation District, (o) Town of  
Paradise, and (p) Butte County. Notably, not all of the public entities with claims against the Debtors  
arising out of the Wildfires are represented or have even made an appearance in these bankruptcies  
21 yet. There could be other public entities that would want to serve on a Public Entities Committee.  
22

23 <sup>2</sup> The 2017 Northern California Wildfires began on October 8, 2017 when multiple wildfires spread  
24 through Northern California, including Napa, Sonoma, Butte, Humboldt, Mendocino, Del Norte, Lake,  
25 Nevada and Yuba Counties, as well as the area surrounding Yuba City. The Debtors acknowledge that  
the 2017 Northern California Wildfires consumed 245,000 acres of land, resulting in at least 44 fatalities  
and the destruction of an estimated 8,900 structures. *See Declaration of Jason P. Wells in Support of First  
Day Motions and Related Relief, Dkt. No. 27 at p. 12-13.*

<sup>3</sup> The 2018 Camp Fire began on November 8, 2018 near the city of Paradise, Butte County, California. The Debtors acknowledge that the 2018 Camp Fire consumed 153,336 acres of land, resulting in at least 86 facilities and the destruction of 13,972 residences, 528 commercial structures and 4,293 other buildings. *See id.* at p. 11-12.

1 bankruptcy cases where governmental units have been impacted in the manner or to the degree  
2 as the Public Entities have been impacted here. The PE Wildfire Claims are, therefore, truly  
3 unique, and must be treated separately from the claims of other creditors in this bankruptcy.

4 Because of their unique interests and claims, the Public Entities have requested that the  
5 United States Trustee (the “*Trustee*”) form an official committee comprised solely of the Public  
6 Entities with respect to the PE Wildfire Claims. Such a committee would represent the Public  
7 Entities solely with respect to the PE Wildfire Claims and not any other claims that the Public  
8 Entities may assert in these bankruptcy cases, such as tax claims or other priority claims more  
9 typical of claims by governmental units. The Trustee has not contested the need for a Public  
10 Entities Committee. Instead, the Trustee has stated that “[a]lthough we do not reject or contest  
11 the reasons you set forth in favor of the appointment of a Public Entities Committee, we have  
12 concluded that appointment of such a committee would be outside the United States Trustee’s  
13 statutory authority.” Esserman Declaration, ¶ 8 and Exhibit C. More specifically, the Trustee  
14 interprets 11 U.S.C. § 1102(b) to provide that only “persons” may serve on an official committee,  
15 and that the Public Entities do not fall under the definition of “persons” under the Bankruptcy  
16 Code.

17 The issue raised by the Trustee is one of first impression for this Circuit. The Public  
18 Entities assert that the United States Trustee’s interpretation of Section 1102(b) is overly  
19 constrictive and is inconsistent with the decisions of other courts who have recognized their  
20 authority to order the formation of an official committee comprised of governmental units.

21 The necessity of a Public Entities Committee cannot be overstated. The substantial  
22 amount of the PE Wildfire Claims (such aggregate amount could be in excess of \$2.5 billion),  
23 the unique nature of those claims, and the importance of the claims to communities affected by  
24 the Wildfires mandate that the Public Entities have official committee representation in order to  
25 assure adequate representation of the Public Entities and their constituencies. The Public Entities  
26 have not been appointed to serve on either of the two existing committees formed by the Trustee:

27  
28

1 the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors (the “*UCC*”)<sup>4</sup> and the Official Committee of Tort  
2 Claimants (the “*Tort Committee*”).<sup>5</sup> It is, therefore, imperative that this Court order the  
3 formation of a Public Entities Committee.

4 An official Public Entities Committee can (and should) serve a unique and significant  
5 role in the Debtors’ bankruptcy. Unlike the creditors represented by the UCC and the Tort  
6 Committee, the Public Entities cannot limit their concerns in these bankruptcies to simply  
7 recovery of their damages. The Public Entities owe a duty to their respective constituencies to  
8 ensure that the Debtors do not compromise safety, reporting, regulatory or other matters affecting  
9 the future health and welfare of the Public Entities’ communities in order to confirm a plan of  
10 reorganization. A separate Public Entity Committee can protect these interests in ways that the  
11 UCC or Tort Committee cannot. It would also allow them to more efficiently play their  
12 necessary role in the Debtors’ the proceedings going forward.

13 For these reasons, as will be set forth in more detail below, the Public Entities ask that  
14 the Court order the Trustee to form a Public Entities Committee.

15 **II.**  
16 **JURISDICTION**

17 The Court has jurisdiction to consider this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 157 and 1334,  
18 the Order Referring Bankruptcy Cases and Proceedings to Bankruptcy Judges, General Order 24  
19 (N.D. Cal.), and Rule 5011-1(a) of the Bankruptcy Local Rules for the United States District  
20 Court for the Northern District of California (the “*Bankruptcy Local Rules*”). This is a core  
21 proceeding pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 157(b). Venue is proper before the Court pursuant to 28  
22 U.S.C. §§ 1408 and 1409.

23  
24  
25 <sup>4</sup> On February 12, 2019, the Trustee formed the UCC. The Public Entities did not apply to be appointed  
26 to the committee and no Public Entities were appointed to the committee. [Dkt. No. 409]  
27  
28

<sup>5</sup> On February 15, 2019, the Trustee formed the Tort Committee. The Public Entities did not apply to be  
29 appointed to the committee and no Public Entities were appointed to the committee. [Dkt. No. 453]

### III. **BACKGROUND**

3        Each of the Public Entities suffered, to varying degrees, damages to one or more of the  
4 following public services: roads, bridges, sidewalks, culverts, drains, storm and water systems  
5 (both damage to and contamination of such systems), traffic lights, stop signs, public  
6 landscaping, art, lost capacities in reservoirs, water storage and landfills. In addition, dead or  
7 dying trees, soil erosion, debris flows, flooding, and mudslides that resulted from the wildfires  
8 are a threat to the public welfare and safety of the communities represented by the Public Entities.  
9 In the face of this massive destruction, the Public Entities' damages have been compounded by  
10 (1) loss of revenue from property, sales, and other taxes, (2) loss of revenue-generating assets  
11 and services, (3) increased costs from workers' compensation claims and overtime, (4) increased  
12 use and need of law enforcement, emergency response personnel, and other public safety  
13 services, and (5) other factors. The Public Entities' claims are unique and unlike the claims  
14 represented by a UCC or generalized Tort Committee. The Public Entities do not seek recovery  
15 on behalf of individuals or businesses affected by the wildfires. Instead, the Public Entities'  
16 interests encompass the very fabric of their constituent communities. The PE Wildfire Claims  
17 are vital to the health and welfare of their respective communities and can only be brought by  
18 the Public Entities.

19 On January 30, 2019, the Public Entities delivered a letter to the Trustee requesting that  
20 the Trustee appoint an official committee of Public Entities. Esserman Declaration, ¶ 4 and  
21 Exhibit A. The Public Entities supplemented their January 30, 2019 letter to the Trustee with a  
22 February 6, 2019 letter that highlighted the unique and particularized nature of the Public  
23 Entities' claims, described the difficulties the Public Entities would have serving on a more  
24 generalized committee, and again requested formation of a Public Entities official committee.  
25 Esserman Declaration, ¶ 5 and Exhibit B.

26 On February 14, 2019, counsel for the Public Entities spoke with the Trustee regarding  
27 the Public Entities' request for a separate official committee. During the conversation, the  
28 Trustee indicated that the Public Entities' request for an official committee was still being

1 considered, and that he would not appoint a Public Entity to the Tort Committee because they  
2 were excluded from the definition of “person” in the Bankruptcy Code. Esserman Declaration,  
3 ¶ 6. On February 19, 2019, counsel for the Public Entities received an email correspondence  
4 from the Trustee’s office stating that the Public Entities’ request for a separate official committee  
5 was still being considered. Esserman Declaration, ¶ 7.

6 On February 20, 2019, the Trustee’s office provided notice to the Public Entities, through  
7 their counsel, stating that the Trustee would not form a Public Entities Committee, because the  
8 Trustee concluded that he lacked statutory authority to form such a committee. Esserman  
9 Declaration, ¶ 8. More specifically, the Trustee stated as follows:

10        Although we do not reject or contest the reasons you set forth in favor of  
11 the appointment of a Public Entities Committee, we have concluded that  
12 appointment of such a committee would be outside the United States Trustee’s  
13 statutory authority. Specifically, the public entities noted in your letter are not  
14 eligible to serve on a committee under the definition of “person” found in 11  
15 U.S.C. § 101(41).

16        11 U.S.C. § 1102(b) governs committee appointments and composition.  
17 Section 1102(b)(1) requires that the United States Trustee appoint “persons” to  
18 serve on official committees. Under 11 U.S.C. § 101(41), “[t]he term ‘person’  
19 includes individual, partnership, and corporation, but does not include  
20 governmental unit . . .” 11 U.S.C. § 101(41).

21        Esserman Declaration, Exhibit C.

22        The Public Entities assert that the Trustee’s interpretation of 11 U.S.C. § 1102(b) is  
23 overly constrictive and inconsistent with decisions of other courts recognizing the authority of  
24 bankruptcy courts to order the formation of a committee of governmental units. Therefore, the  
25 Public Entities seek an order of this Court for the formation of a separate official committee of  
26 Public Entities.

27        //

28        //

29        //

**IV.**  
**BASIS FOR RELIEF REQUESTED**

A. **The Court should order the formation of a Public Entities Committee pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §§ 1102(a)(2) and pursuant to the Court's authority under 11 U.S.C. § 105.**

Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1102(a)(2), “[o]n request of a party in interest, the court may order the appointment of additional committees of creditors or of equity security holders if necessary, to assure adequate representation of creditors or of equity security holders.” Section 1102(b) addresses the composition of any such committee of creditors as follows:

(b)(1) A committee of creditors appointed under subsection (a) of this section ***shall ordinarily consist*** of the persons, willing to serve, that hold the seven largest claims against the debtor of the kinds represented on such committee, or of the members of a committee organized by creditors before the commencement of the case under this chapter, if such committee was fairly chosen and is representative of the different kinds of claims to be represented.

11 U.S.C. § 1102(b) (emphasis supplied).

The Trustee has not contested the Public Entities' grounds for formation of a Public Entities Committee in these bankruptcy cases. Instead, the Trustee incorrectly interprets 11 U.S.C. § 1102(b) to prohibit any creditors other than "persons" from serving on a committee. However, the plain language of 11 U.S.C. § 1102(b) provides for no such prohibition. Section 1102(b) only provides an example of what a committee of creditors shall *ordinarily* consist of. A committee will ordinarily not consist of governmental units, because in most bankruptcy cases those creditors hold liquidated priority claims that may also be secured, such as tax claims, which do not require committee representation. However, as noted above, this is no ordinary bankruptcy and the PE Wildfire Claims are no ordinary claims. The PE Wildfire Claims (which could exceed \$2.5 billion) arise in tort, are unliquidated and unsecured, and will raise unique issues of valuation and treatment under any plan of reorganization proposed by the Debtors. As discussed in depth below, these factors mandate separate committee representation for the Public Entities.

1 At least two other courts have interpreted 11 U.S.C. § 1102(b) to permit the formation of  
2 an official committee comprised of governmental units.<sup>6</sup> In *In re Lion Capital Group*, 44 B.R.  
3 684 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1984), the bankruptcy court heard a motion by the Greenburg Central  
4 School District No. 7, requesting the formation of a special committee of creditors pursuant to  
5 Section 1102(a)(2). The court held that “the municipalities and school districts claimants in this  
6 case could so serve because, *inter alia*, the provision of § 1102(b)(1) that only ‘persons’ could  
7 ‘ordinarily’ serve on a committee was not an absolute bar and because the claims of  
8 municipalities and school districts were not tax claims entitled to priority.” *In re Lion Capital*  
9 *Group*, 44 B.R. at 685. The court later ordered the formation of an official special committee to  
10 which the acting United States Trustee appointed only governmental units. Notably, as  
11 recognized by the court, the claims of the governmental units in *Lion Capital* were not for priority  
12 claims traditionally asserted by governmental units but were instead related to the sale of United  
13 States Treasury obligations most, if not all, of which were subject to pre-petition open repurchase  
14 transactions between the debtor and the governmental units. *Id.* at 685.

15 Similarly, in *In re Gates Engineering Co., Inc.*, 104 B.R. 653 (Bankr. Del. 1989), the  
16 State of Tennessee asked the court to permit governmental units to serve on a Warranty Claims  
17 Committee formed in that bankruptcy case and, in the alternative, the formation of a separate  
18 governmental entities committee. The court recognized that, because of the nature of  
19 Tennessee’s claims, it was not functioning as a governmental unit when asserting those claims,  
20 but instead had the same interests as other members of the Warranty Claims Committee.  
21 However, the court determined that it did not have authority over the composition of committees

22  
23  
24  
25 <sup>6</sup> In *In re Am. Atomics Corp.*, 2 B.R. 526 (Bankr. D. Ariz. 1980), *In re Baldwin-United Corp.*, 38 B.R.  
26 802 (S.D. Ohio 1984), and *In re Mansfield Tire & Rubber Co.*, 39 B.R. 974 (N.D. Ohio 1983), the courts  
27 ruled that governmental units could not serve on an unsecured creditors committee because the  
28 governmental units were not “persons” as defined by the Bankruptcy Code. However, these cases are  
not binding on this Court. Furthermore, they are distinguishable from the case at bar, because the Public  
Entities are not seeking to serve on the UCC but are instead requesting a separate Public Entities  
Committee comprised solely of the Public Entities.

...Continued

1 appointed by the U.S. Trustee,<sup>7</sup> and therefore, could not dictate to the Trustee who was to serve  
2 on the Warranty Claims Committee. The court then turned to Tennessee's request for alternative  
3 relief. The court determined that it had authority to order the formation of a governmental unit  
4 committee, stating “[t]he alternative request for a governmental entities committee is one upon  
5 which the court has authority to act under § 1102(b)(2).<sup>8</sup> While the *Gates Engineering* court did  
6 not find that such a committee of governmental units was warranted under the circumstances of  
7 that case, it clearly recognized the authority of bankruptcy courts to form such committees.

8 Here, as in *Lion Capital*, the Public Entities claims are not the types of claims  
9 traditionally brought by governmental units in bankruptcies and the need for committee  
10 representation for the Public Entities is paramount.

11 Even if Section 1102(b) does not provide explicit authority for this Court to order the  
12 formation of a Public Entities committee (which, the Public Entities contend that it does), this  
13 Court may, and should, exercise its authority under 11 U.S.C. § 105(a) to order the formation of  
14 a Public Entities Committee. Section 105(a) gives the bankruptcy courts the power to issue  
15 orders it deems appropriate to carry out the provisions in Title 11.<sup>9</sup> *In re Mercury Finance Co.*,  
16 240 B.R. 270, 277 (N.D. Ill. 1999) (citing *In re K.P. Enterprise*, 135 B.R. 174, 186 (Bankr. D.  
17 Me. 1992). “This authority ‘exceeds the equitable authority available under ‘tradition equity  
18 jurisprudence.’” *In re City of Detroit, Mich.*, 519 B.R. 673, 679 (Bankr. E.D. Mich. 2014)  
19 (quoting *In re Mehlhose*, 469 B.R. 694, 710 (Bankr. E.D. Mich. 2012)). These broad equitable

20  
21 <sup>7</sup> In 2005, Congress restored the explicit statutory authority of bankruptcy courts to order changes to the  
22 membership of creditors' committees with the inclusion of 11 U.S.C. § 1102(a)(4). *In re ShoreBank*  
23 *Corp.*, 467 B.R. 156, 160 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 2012).

24  
25 <sup>8</sup> The court's reference to the Bankruptcy Code, Section 1102(b)(2) appears to be a typographical error.  
26 Section 1102(b)(2) pertains to the composition of a committee of equity security holders. The court's  
27 reference should have been to 11 U.S.C. § 1102(a)(2), which pertains to the appointment of additional  
committees.

28  
29 <sup>9</sup> More specifically, 11 U.S.C. § 105(a) provides that “[t]he court may issue any order, process, or  
30 judgment that is necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title. No provision of this  
31 title providing for the raising of an issue by a party in interest shall be construed to preclude the court  
32 from, sua sponte, taking any action or making any determination necessary or appropriate to enforce or  
implement court orders or rules, or to prevent an abuse of process.” 11 U.S.C. § 105(a).

1 powers are, however, constrained to actions or determinations that are not inconsistent with the  
2 Bankruptcy Code. *City of Detroit, Mich.* at 680 (*citing ADT Corp. v. Advantage Pkg. Inc. (In re*  
3 *ADT Corp.*), 352 F.3d 1062, 1066 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2003)).

4 Here, formation of a Public Entities Committee is not inconsistent with the Bankruptcy  
5 Code. Nowhere does the Bankruptcy Code expressly prohibit this Court from ordering the  
6 formation of a separate committee for the Public Entities. The Public Entities must have a unified  
7 voice and the Debtors must have one point of contact when dealing with the Public Entities, not  
8 only for resolution of the PE Wildfire Claims, but also any regulatory or legislative relief for  
9 which the Debtors may require the support or acquiescence of the Public Entities. To preclude  
10 committee representation to the Public Entities under such circumstances cannot have been the  
11 intent of Congress when drafting 11 U.S.C. § 1102(b).

12 Indeed, the 1994 amendment to 11 U.S.C. § 101(41)'s definition of "person" to include  
13 certain governmental units for purposes of Section 1102 evidences Congress' acknowledgment  
14 that there should not be an absolute bar of committee representation for governmental units.<sup>10</sup>  
15 While, the 1994 amendment to the definition of "person" does not expressly contemplate the PE

---

16 <sup>10</sup> In 1994, Congress amended the Bankruptcy Code to include the following types of governmental  
17 units within the definition of "person" for purposes of Section 1102 as follows:

18 . . . a governmental unit that—

19 (A) acquires an asset from a person—

20 (i) as a result of the operation of a loan guarantee agreement; or

21 (ii) as receiver or liquidating agent of a person;

22 (B) is a guarantor of a pension benefit payable by or on behalf of the debtor or an  
23 affiliate of the debtor; or

24 (C) is the legal or beneficial owner of an asset of—

25 (i) an employee pension benefit plan that is a governmental plan, as defined in  
section 414(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; or

26 (ii) an eligible deferred compensation plan, as defined in section 457(b) of the  
Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

27 shall be considered, for purposes of section 1102 of this title, to be a person with respect to such  
28 asset or such benefit.

1 Wildfire Claims, neither Congress nor anyone else could have foreseen the mass devastation that  
2 has given rise to the PE Wildfire Claims. Without an express prohibition in the Bankruptcy  
3 Code against governmental units serving on a committee in the Bankruptcy Code, Congress'  
4 identification of certain types of claims that may *ordinarily* permit a governmental unit to serve  
5 on a general creditors committee should not be interpreted to bar the formation of a separate  
6 Public Entities Committee where, as here, the circumstances demand it. *See In re City of Detroit,*  
7 *Mich.*, 519 B.R. 673, 680 (Bankr. E.D. Mich. 2014) (holding that vacating the appointment of a  
8 committee is not inconsistent with the bankruptcy code where the bankruptcy code does not  
9 explicitly prohibit the bankruptcy court from doing so); *In re Pierce*, 237 B.R. 748, 753-54  
10 (Bankr. E.D. Cal. 1999) (holding that section 105 could be utilized by bankruptcy courts to  
11 review the United States Trustee's committee appointment prior to the addition of Section  
12 1102(a)(4) to the Bankruptcy Code, where "the court does not believe that Congress intended to  
13 grant the UST wholly unfettered discretion in appointing committee members"). Where, as  
14 here, the governing authority (i.e., 11 U.S.C. § 1102(b)) does not expressly prohibit this Court  
15 from taking action, the Court may use its powers under 11 U.S.C. § 105(a) to take such action if  
16 the Court, exercising its discretion, determines that doing so is necessary or appropriate to carry  
17 out the provisions of title 11.

18 **B. Formation of a Public Entities Committee is necessary and proper to provide the  
19 Public Entities with adequate representation in these bankruptcy cases.**

20 The Public Entities need committee representation in order to be adequately represented  
21 in these bankruptcy proceedings. Bankruptcy Code, Section 1102(a) "affords no test of  
22 adequate representation leaving the bankruptcy courts with discretion to examine the facts of  
23 each case to determine if additional committees are warranted." *In re Mansfield Ferrous*  
24 *Castings, Inc.*, 96 B.R. 779, 781 (Bankr. N.D. Ohio 1988) (*citing In re Beker Indus. Corp.*, 55  
25 B.R. 945, 948 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1985) and *In re Johns-Manville Corp.* 68 B.R. 155 (S.D.N.Y.  
26 1986)). "In deciding whether appointment of additional creditors' committee is necessary to  
27 ensure adequate representation, courts have considered many and diverse factors, including (1)  
28 ability of existing committee to function; (2) nature of Chapter 11 case; (3) standing and desires

1 of the various constituencies; (4) ability of creditors to participate in case without an additional  
2 committee; (5) delay and additional cost that would result if appointment were granted; (6) tasks  
3 that the separate committee would perform; and (7) other factors relevant to adequate  
4 representation issue.” *In re Budd Co., Inc.*, 512 B.R. 910, 912-13 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 2014) (citing  
5 *In re Residential Capital, LLC*, 480 B.R. 550 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2012)). No one factor is  
6 dispositive, and the amount of due consideration given to each depends on the circumstances of  
7 the particular chapter 11 case. *In re Budd*, 512 B.R. at 913. As discussed below, application of  
8 these factors dictates that a separate Public Entities Committee be formed in these bankruptcy  
9 cases for purposes of adequately representing the interests of the Public Entities.

10       **1.       *The unique interests of the Public Entities require formation of a separate  
11           Public Entities Committee***

12       The PE Wildfire Claims are unique and differ substantially from the claims of other  
13 creditors in these bankruptcy cases. While the general unsecured creditors and the tort claimants  
14 seek damages owed to them as individuals or entities related to contract claims, vendor debt,  
15 personal injury, property damage, and related claims, the Public Entities have suffered damages  
16 more public in nature, such as infrastructure damages, fire suppression costs, debris cleanup, and  
17 loss of tax revenue. The unique nature of the PE Wildfire Claims has consistently been  
18 recognized by the Debtors as requiring that those claims be treated separately and distinctly from  
19 other claims against the Debtors.

20       From the first day of these bankruptcy cases, the Debtors have recognized that the PE  
21 Wildfire Claims are separate and distinct from other wildfire claims, let alone general unsecured  
22 claims or non-wildfire related tort claims.<sup>11</sup> This separate treatment of the Public Entities’ claims  
23 in these bankruptcy cases is consistent with how the PE Wildfire Claims were dealt with in the  
24 tort system. In the pre-petition wildfire litigation, the Superior Court of California, County of  
25 San Francisco identified four distinct classes of wildfire claimants and recognized the need to

26  
27       <sup>11</sup> See Declaration of Jason P. Wells in Support of First Day Motions and Related Relief, Bankr. N.D.  
28 Cal. Docket No. 27 at p. 14-16.

...Continued

1 treat each class of wildfire claimant separately.<sup>12</sup> The Superior Court of California appointed  
2 separate lead counsel for the Public Entities in that litigation<sup>13</sup> and required that each class of  
3 claimants (including the Public Entities) submit separate complaints to the Court.<sup>14</sup> The Superior  
4 Court of California recognized that the Public Entities, individual claimants, and the subrogation  
5 claimants each have separate interests and determined that it is appropriate to address each class  
6 of claims separately. Similarly, in the pre-petition wildfire litigation, the *Hon. Jay C. Gandhi*  
7 (*Ret.*) was appointed as mediator (the “**Public Entities Mediator**”) to deal solely with the Public  
8 Entities’ claims. The cost of the Public Entities Mediator has been paid, in part, by the Debtors.  
9 The mediation of the Public Entities’ claims has been conducted separate and apart from the  
10 mediation of the individual claimants’ claims and the subrogation claimants’ claims. Notably,  
11 the Debtors have attended several mediation sessions with the Public Entities after the Debtors’  
12 bankruptcy petition date, and the Public Entities Mediator has continued to serve in his role as  
13 the separate mediator for just the Public Entities’ claims. It is contemplated that the separate  
14 mediation of the Public Entities’ claims will continue, as will the Public Entities Mediator’s role  
15 therein.

16 The Public Entities have separate and distinct interests, different types of damages, and  
17 the bases of the PE Wildfire Claims differ from the general unsecured creditors and other tort  
18 claimants. In light of the discrete nature of the PE Wildfire Claims, there will likely be numerous  
19 issues and matters that arise during these bankruptcy proceedings where the interests of the  
20 Public Entities will diverge and are quite different from those of the general unsecured creditors  
21 or other tort claimants. Both the Debtors and the pre-petition litigation court have recognized the  
22 separate interests of Public Entities and have determined that it is appropriate to address the  
23

---

24 <sup>12</sup> See Case Management Order No. 1, Coordination Proceeding Special Title [Rule 3.550] *California*  
25 *North Bay Fire Cases* attached as Exhibit D to the Esserman Declaration. The Superior Court of  
26 California separated wildfire claimants into the following categories: (1) the individual plaintiffs  
(individuals and businesses damaged by the fires), (2) the public entities, (3) class action plaintiffs, and  
(4) the insurer subrogation claimants.

27 <sup>13</sup> See *id.* at p. 6.

28 <sup>14</sup> See *id.* at p. 11.

1 Public Entities' claims separately. For the same reasons, a separate Public Entities Committee  
2 is proper in these proceedings.

3 ***2. The nature of these bankruptcy cases calls for a separate Public Entities  
4 Committee.***

5 In bankruptcy proceedings of this magnitude, it is not only common, but crucial to fair  
6 and orderly proceedings, to form multiple committees in order to ensure that discrete classes of  
7 claimants with substantial claims (here, the Public Entities have aggregate claims against the  
8 Debtors which could be in excess of \$2.5 billion) are provided adequate representation and  
9 recognition. As noted, the Trustee has already formed committees for unsecured creditors and  
10 for tort claimants.

11 Given the size of the Public Entities' claims, it is evident that the Debtors cannot have a  
12 meaningful reorganization without providing for a meaningful recovery by the Public Entities.  
13 It is not an option for the Debtors to simply allow the PE Wildfire Claims (which could be in  
14 excess of \$2.5 billion) to simply "pass through" the bankruptcy. Due to the public nature of the  
15 Public Entities claims, and the exigencies of the safety and welfare of thousands of citizens  
16 associated with those claims, a Public Entities Committee is necessary to provide a centralized  
17 point of contact for the Debtors when negotiating a viable plan of reorganization that adequately  
18 provides for the Public Entities and the communities for whom they are responsible.

19 Furthermore, the Debtors' reorganization plans contemplate negotiating with regulators  
20 and policymakers (*i.e.*, legislatures) to implement extraordinary measures to stabilize the  
21 Debtors' financial condition.<sup>15</sup> The Debtors will almost certainly request the support of the  
22 Public Entities on any attempts by the Debtors to obtain legislative or regulatory relief as part  
23 of the plan process. The Debtors could need the support of the Public Entities both for purposes

24 <sup>15</sup> In the Debtors January 13, 2019 Form 8-K, the Debtors state that one consideration going into this  
25 bankruptcy was "the likelihood that regulators and policy makers were willing and able to timely  
26 implement extraordinary measures to stabilize PG&E's financial condition" and "the unique nature of  
27 California's doctrine of inverse condemnation and whether it is possible for PG&E to continue to own  
28 and operate all of its current assets as an investor-owned utility subject to that doctrine." (PG&E Jan. 12,  
2019 Form 8-K). Similarly, the Debtors have indicated that one of its principal objects of this bankruptcy  
is to work collaboratively with State regulators and policy makers to address PG&E's liability and future  
operations.

1 of obtaining support for new legislation in the legislature and to obtain public support for any  
2 legislative measures pursued by the Debtors. It is incumbent upon each Public Entity to  
3 represent the interests of its community with respect to any position taken on new or existing  
4 legislation proposed or sought by the Debtors. Under no circumstances may the Public Entities  
5 have a position on legislative acts imposed on them merely because they were out-voted by  
6 UCC members or Tort Committee members representing the interests of individual claimants.  
7 Similarly, the Public Entities cannot be placed in a position where they are deemed (by UCC or  
8 Tort Committee action) to have approved or supported any position taken by the Debtors with  
9 respect to any regulatory commissions. For the Public Entities to consider any such measures  
10 by the Debtors, the Public Entities should act as a centralized and independent body. A Public  
11 Entities Committee will provide the needed centralization and independence.

3. *The unique nature of the Public Entities' Wildfire Claims requires that they be represented by a separate, homogeneous committee.*

14 Creditors appointed to a committee hold a fiduciary duty to the respective constituencies  
15 represented by the applicable committee. While a typical tort claimant is interested primarily, if  
16 not solely, in recovering its individual financial damages, the Public Entities have broader  
17 concerns, including providing for the public safety and welfare of all of their citizens. Those  
18 concerns encompass not only adequate funding for rebuilding public works, but also  
19 consideration of the reorganized debtors' ability and willingness to provide services in a safe and  
20 responsible manner going forward.

21 The Public Entities cannot disregard or dilute the existing duties owed to their  
22 communities in order to act on behalf of a broader constituency of individual and business  
23 claimants whose interests may not always be aligned with those of the public welfare.  
24 Participation of the Public Entities on a committee comprised of anything but the Public Entities  
25 could present circumstances where the interests of the Public Entities' communities diverge from  
26 the interests of the committee's constituents. Where those interests cannot be reconciled, the  
27 Public Entities could be placed in a difficult situation.

1        The ability of the existing committees to function properly is a factor in the  
2 determination of whether a court should order the appointment of another committee. *See In re*  
3 *Dana Corp.*, 344 B.R. 35, 38 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2006) (recognizing that “[t]he ability of an  
4 official committee to function is a significant factor in the determination of whether a court  
5 should order the appointment of another committee”). Here, any committee that will require  
6 the Public Entities to divide their duties among differing constituencies will be problematic  
7 from the outset. These bankruptcy proceedings require committee representation for the Public  
8 Entities. That representation must be in the form of a committee comprised solely of Public  
9 Entities.

10        **4. *A Public Entities Committee would perform tasks that the UCC and Tort  
Committee will not fulfill.***

12        To the Public Entities, resolution of the Debtors’ liability for the wildfires is not simply  
13 an exercise of estimating aggregate damages and determining a fair allocation of the monies  
14 available to compensate victims. The Public Entities have the unique interest of also ensuring  
15 that the Debtors do not compromise future safety, reporting, operational or other matters in these  
16 bankruptcies in order to confirm a plan of reorganization. The Public Entities are charged with  
17 protecting the interests of all their existing and future citizens. They cannot sacrifice future  
18 concerns for other consideration. This interest in the future safety and welfare of the Public  
19 Entities’ communities can be juxtaposed to limited interests of other creditors in these  
20 bankruptcies who may be solely concerned with recovery of as much of their claims as possible.  
21 While a UCC or Tort Committee may take positions on issues without regard to the effect on the  
22 Debtors’ future operations and safety measures, the Public Entities cannot. A separate Public  
23 Entity Committee, therefore, can protect the interest of the future safety and welfare of the  
24 communities served by the Debtors in ways that a UCC or Tort Committee will not.

25

26

27

28

1       5. ***Formation of a Public Entities Committee would not result in delay or***  
2       ***unreasonable additional costs.***

3           Formation of a Public Entities Committee will not result in any delay in the bankruptcy  
4       proceedings. These bankruptcy cases are approximately a month old, and the UCC and Tort  
5       Committees were formed less than two weeks ago. Furthermore, while “[t]he potential added  
6       cost is not sufficient in itself to deprive the creditors of the formation of an additional committee  
7       if one is otherwise appropriate,”<sup>16</sup> it is worth noting that a Public Entities Committee will likely  
8       not result in appreciable additional costs to the Debtors’ estates. Given the focus of the Public  
9       Entities, a Public Entities Committee may not need to engage investment bankers or accountants,  
10      if it could rely on the accountants engaged by the other official committees for information and  
11      analysis relevant to the Public Entities in some equal sharing arrangement. A Public Entities  
12      Committee could share certain professionals such as accountants, investment bankers and the  
13      like and need not engage separate professionals (except for lawyers) at this time, unless the  
14      Bankruptcy Court agrees to such relief.<sup>17</sup> Finally, the appointment of an Official Committee of  
15      Public Entities may very well expedite resolution of key issues in these bankruptcy cases, which  
16      would save considerable administrative costs for Debtors.

17      //

18      //

19      //

20      //

21      

22      

23      

24      

25      

---

26      <sup>16</sup> *In re Hills Stores, Co.*, 137 B.R. 4, 6 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1992); *see also In re Budd*, 512 B.R. at 915.

27      <sup>17</sup> An Official Committee of Public Entities would only need to engage its own accountants or financial  
28      advisors in the event there is a dispute with the other committees or issues arise regarding the sharing of  
    information among the committees, assuming equal sharing of and access to such professionals.

## V. CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, the Public Entities respectfully request that this Court enter an order, pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1102(a)(2) and/or § 105(a), directing the United States Trustee to promptly appoint an Official Committee of Public Entities consisting of the members of the Public Entities, and for such other and further relief as the Court deems appropriate.

Dated: March 1, 2019

STUTZMAN, BROMBERG, ESSERMAN &  
PLIFKA, P.C.

By: /s/ Sander L. Esserman  
Sander L. Esserman

## Counsel for Creditors Public Entities Impacted by the Wildfires

Dated: March 1, 2019

## BARON & BUDD, P.C.

By: /s/ Scott Summy  
Scott Summy

## Counsel for Creditors Public Entities Impacted by the Wildfires

Dated: March 1, 2019

## NUTI HART LLP

By: /s/ Kimberly S. Fineman  
Kimberly S. Fineman

## Counsel for Creditors Public Entities Impacted by the Wildfires

1  
2 **EXHIBIT B**  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28



## U.S. Department of Justice

*United States Trustee  
Northern and Eastern  
Districts of California and Nevada*

---

*Regional Office  
450 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 05-0153  
San Francisco, California 94102*

*415-705-3300  
FAX 415-705-3367*

*Website address: [www.usdoj.gov/ust/r17](http://www.usdoj.gov/ust/r17)*

February 20, 2019

Sander L. Esserman  
Stutzman, Bromberg, Esserman & Plifka  
2323 Bryan Street  
Suite 2200  
Dallas, TX 75201-2689

Re: PG&E, Case No. 19-30088  
Request for Public Entities Committee

Dear Mr. Esserman:

Thank you for your letter of February 6, 2019, in which you ask the United States Trustee to consider appointing an Official Committee of Public Entities (“Public Entities Committee”) in PG&E’s jointly administered chapter 11 case.

Although we do not reject or contest the reasons you set forth in favor of the appointment of a Public Entities Committee, we have concluded that appointment of such a committee would be outside the United States Trustee’s statutory authority. Specifically, the public entities noted in your letter are not eligible to serve on a committee under the definition of “person” found in 11 U.S.C. § 101(41).

11 U.S.C. § 1102(b) governs committee appointments and composition. Section 1102(b)(1) requires that the United States Trustee appoint “persons” to serve on official committees. Under 11 U.S.C. § 101(41), “[t]he term ‘person’ includes individual, partnership, and corporation, but does not include governmental unit. . . .” 11 U.S.C. § 101(41). Before 1994, the Bankruptcy Code’s definition of “person” excluded all governmental units. In 1994 Congress amended the Bankruptcy Code to include a very limited subset of governmental units (not applicable here) within the definition of “person” for purposes of § 1102. *Id.* Had Congress intended for all governmental units to be eligible for committee service, the amendment would not have been so narrowly and specifically tailored.

Moreover, the change was adopted in § 106 of the Bankruptcy Reform Act of 1994, Pub.L.No. 103-394 (1994), which was entitled “Definition Relating to Eligibility to Serve on Chapter 11 Committees.” Although the title of the section of the bill is not technically part of the legislation, it clearly indicates Congressional intent. Only governmental units holding the defined types of claims are “persons” eligible to serve on committees. Other governmental units are not eligible for committee membership. The public entities identified in your correspondence are governmental units of the type excluded from appointment to a committee pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1102(b)(1). As such, the United States Trustee lacks the statutory authority to form the requested committee.

Thank you for raising this issue and please let me know if you want to discuss this matter further.

Respectfully,

*Andrew R. Vara*

Andrew Vara

Acting United States Trustee

James Snyder

Acting United States Trustee

cc:     Donna S. Tamanaha, Assistant United States Trustee for Region 17 (415-705-3300)  
          Timothy Laffredi, Assistant United States Trustee for Region 17 (408-535-5525 x229)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
STUTZMAN BROMBERG ESSERMAN & PLIFKA, P.C.  
2323 BRYAN STREET, SUITE 2200  
DALLAS, TX 75201-2689  
TELEPHONE: 214-969-4900

## **EXHIBIT C**

**From:** Sander L. Esserman  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 28, 2019 12:52 PM  
**To:** [stephen.karotkin@weil.com](mailto:stephen.karotkin@weil.com)  
**Cc:** [matthew.goren@weil.com](mailto:matthew.goren@weil.com); Cliff I. Taylor <[taylor@sbep-law.com](mailto:taylor@sbep-law.com)>  
**Subject:** PGE

Steve—thank you for the time this morning to discuss the motion for a Public Entities Committee. We request that this matter be set on the docket for March 13<sup>th</sup>, with a response date of March 11<sup>th</sup>. I would hope you would agree to those dates, if not, we will submit it to the Court to place on the agenda for that date and the Court will either do so or place it on another date as he sees appropriate. As I mentioned, the position of the U.S. Trustee is—they think there might be merit to a Public Entities Committee, but believe the U.S. Trustee lacks statutory authority to appoint any public entity to any committee (or to form a Public Entities Committee) because the definition of “persons” under the bankruptcy code does not include a “governmental unit” except in limited inapplicable circumstances. Section 101 (41). I think they are mistaken and there is case law to the contrary as well as the statute itself as we explain in the moving papers. These issues have been pending and have been discussed with the U.S. Trustee during much of February.

I think a Public Entities Committee should be formed for the following reasons (among others):

- Not all public entities are represented or have even made an appearance in the bankruptcy yet. There could be other public entities that would want to serve on a Public Entities Committee.
- The public entities should have a unified voice, and the Debtors should have one point of contact when dealing with the public entities and negotiating a plan of reorganization.
- The public entities will need a forum to consider and take unified action on any regulatory or legislative relief for which the Debtors may seek the support or acquiescence of the public entities.
- The public entities have separate and distinct interests, different types of damages, and the bases of their claims differ from the general unsecured creditors and other tort claimants.
- There will likely be numerous issues and matters that arise during these bankruptcy proceedings where the interests of the public entities will diverge from those of the other creditors and the public entities should be provided a mechanism to act as a group.

We would further request as part of our motion to share certain financial professionals with the Tort Committee or Unsecured Committee should they so consent such that a Public Entities Committee could have access to and direct inquiries to a financial professional. I would hope this would save the Debtor the expense of having separate financial advisors for the proposed, but such arrangement is in large part dependent on the view of others.

I look forward to your response, hopefully by the close of business today.

Thanks,

Sandy

Sander Esserman  
Stutzman, Bromberg, Esserman & Plifka,  
A Professional Corporation  
2323 Bryan Street, Suite 2200  
Dallas, Texas 75201-2689  
Telephone: (214) 969-4910  
Facsimile: (214) 969-4999  
Email: [esserman@sbep-law.com](mailto:esserman@sbep-law.com)

This e-mail message, including any attachments, is intended only for the confidential use of the recipient(s) named above and, if intended as an attorney-client communication and/or work product, should be considered privileged and confidential. If you have received this message in error, please notify us by reply e-mail and then delete the original message. Nothing contained in this email message nor any attachment shall satisfy the requirements for a writing nor constitute a contract or electronic signature under the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act, Uniform Electronic Transactions Act nor any other law, rule or regulation, now or hereafter in effect, governing electronic transactions.